tice of suspension from all discharge of his clerical duties and offices, and the execution thereof, that is to say, from the preaching of the Word of God and the administration of the Sacraments, and the celebration of other clerical duties and offices; and, further, that he pay the costs of this application.

The Lord Chancellor stated that the Archbishop of York was unavoidably absent in consequence of having to perform duties in his diocese, but that he concurred in the judgment.

HIBBERT *v.* PURCHAS.

The argument of Dr. Stephens, lasted the greatest part of five days. The learned gentleman contended that the reformation took place at the accession of Queen Elizabeth, and that it made illegal pretty nearly everything that had been used in churches before. In enforcing this argument he read almost every scrap of print that bore, however indirectly on any of the questions; and the reporters state that the tables, seats, and floors were covered with books from which extracts were taken literally by hundreds. He insisted either that the effect of the Act of Uniformity was to sweep away the old superstitious vestments altogether, abolishing the service of the mass with all its adjuncts, instruments, and symbols, including the chasuble. the tunicle, and alb; or that if the Act did not by its own force abolish all these vestments, then the Crown must have exercised the power reserved to it by the 25th section of regulating the ornaments of the minister, and have abolished the use of these vestments. The result would be the same in either case. He also urged that there was a difference between the "superstitious" copes of former ages and the "decent" copes prescribed by the canons. And that in the rubric a distinction was to be observed between the use of the word "priest" and the word "minister," one being applied to cases in which the rubric had anything to do with sacrifice, and the other to cases in which it had not. The Lord Chancellor, however, thought this distinction was not tenable; on the contrary, he believed the words were used interchangeably in the Prayer-book. Dr. Stephens ssid it was plain that if it became illegal to teach the mass orally, it must also have been illegal to teach the mass symbolically by the use of vestments. Under the royal injunctions, Commissioners went about in the reign of Elizabeth, destroying those portions of the furniture of the mass which were regarded as superstitious; and the sacrificial vestments were accordingly abolished, while the others were retained. The Lord Chancellor said that Dr. Stephens had throughout been extremely anxious to distinguish between the superstitious and the non-superstitious copes. But he thought the gentlemen who went about the country with this commission would not have been so careful in drawing distinctions.

Lord Hatherley, interrupting another portion of Dr. Stephens's argument, said there would be little doubt that the bulk of the people received and acted on the *Advertisements* of Queen Elizabeth as if they were of binding authority. But, of course, the question as to their being authoritative remained perfectly distinct. Dr. Stephens would be quite satisfied if the Court would state that they believed the *Advertisements* to have been universally regarded as authorized and binding. He contended that these instruments were lawful. The fact that they were issued and obeyed, in itself raises a presumption that they were lawful, and there is evidence, at least, of *ex post facto* recognition by the Queen. Moreover, the usage of the church has been in strict accordance with this spirit for upwards of three centuries.

On the 18th ult., there were present the Lord Chancellor, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, and Lord Chelmsford.

Dr. Stephens continued his address to the Court, maintaining that the action of the authorities from the time of Elizabeth to the year 1604 was uniform in rejecting sacrificial vestments, and progressively restrictive in the use of the cope. Additional importance, he contended, must be ascribed to the decisions and course pursued by the prelates seeing that under the 1st and 2d Victoria, cap. 6, they exercised judicial power. Counsel reviewed the proceedings in connexion with the Savoy Conference, in 1661, drawing from the subjects which did engage the attention of that assembly the inference that the Church of England must have been at that time very far removed indeed from the use of vestments, the legality of which it was sought in the present day to establish. He would next consider the specific charges against Mr. Purchas. One of these was for "wearing or bearing in his hand, a certain cap or covering for the head, called a biretta." The 18th Canon laid down that no man should cover his head during Divine service unless it was necessary that he should do so owing to some infirmity, and then he was to use a nightcap—not a cap worn in bed, but a close-fitting cap.

Lord Chelmsford asked for information as to the form of this biretta, and whether a specimen could be produced.

One was accordingly produced. It was formed of two portions; first, a soft, black silk skull cap; and outside this a stiff, four-sided framework, sloping down from the top towards the forehead and sides of the head, enclosing the skull-cap in a species of case. The technical name of the external framework, as given in the *Directorium Anglicanum*—a work of authority on such matters—is the "zucchetto"—in form "like the lower half of a pyramid, inverted." The "biretta" includes both the skull-cap and zucchetto, within which latter the skull-cap is buttoned.

Lord Chelmsford asked whether the biretta was symbolical of anything.

Dr. Stephens said it was symbolical of the glory of the priesthood and was worn in processions. When the priests walked or sat down, they kept the biretta on their heads, but took it off when they reached the altar. He had seen Cardinal Cullen officiating in such a cap. It was a non-episcopal form of mitre, which had not been worn in the English Church since the time of Elizabeth.

The Lord Chancellor thought it was really a waste of time to introduce a matter of so trival a character into the argument.

Dr. Stephens said the matter had been taken up and discussed with a good deal of warmth elsewhere.

Lord Chelmsford. — But we are perfectly cool.

The Archbishop of YORK said he found by the evidence that Mr. Purchas had worn this cap during a procession which had been pronounced illegal by the Court below. Had the cap been used in any ceremonial other than this procession?

Dr. Stephens.—No.

Lord Chelmsford wanted to know whether Dr. Stephens required more than the condemnation of the procession in which the cap was worn.

Dr. Stephens said his difficulty arose from the fact that the Judge of the Court below had held the cap itself to be lswful. Counsel next proceeded to consider the legality of the wafer bread used in the Communion Service, and had not concluded his argument on this point when the Court adjourned.

At the sitting of the Court on the following day—

Dr. Stephens, resumed his argument, contending, with regard to the use of wafer bread in the Holy Communion, that it was no longer permissible; for, although the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI. provided for the use of unleavened bread, and, "for avoiding all matters and occasions of dissension," declared it to be "meet that the bread prepared for the Commnion be made through all this realm after one sort of fashion, that is to say, unleavened and round," the rubric in the later Prayer-book provided, "And to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition which any person hath or might have concerning the bread and wine, it shall not suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten, but the best and purest wheat bread that may conveniently be gotten." He cited passages from various authorities to show what the practice of bishops had been who themselves assisted in the compilation of the Prayer-book, and said that no visitation article could be produced in which there was any allusion to the use of wafer-bread. Passing to the question of mixing water with the wine, he argued that such mixing being admittedly illegal during the administration of the Holy Communion it was equally illegal if performed beforehand in the vestry, or in the clergyman's own house. It was a new ceremony, not authorized by the rubric. In a visitation charge delivered at Truro in 1866 by the late Bishop of Exeter, his Grace said, "I have been told that there among you those who, in administering the blessed Sacrament, depart from the custom and ordinances of the Church, and by so doing violate the solemn promise and vow they took at the time of their ordination. They do so by doing that which, while I freely and fully admit it may not be an actual sin, has no high authority or example in its favour. I am told there are those who mix water with the wine which is given in the blessed Sacrament. Now, if it had pleased our Church to continue such an ordinance among us, we should, of course, have all gladly observed it; but what right have any of us to set up our own judgment, our own fancy or opinions, when they are adverse to the institutions of the early Church, and in contradiction to those institutions of our own Church which are entitled to our reverence and thankful obedience? At the time of the Reformation it did not please the Church of England to continue the practice of mixing water with wine; and you are the ministers of that Church, and bound to obey the orders of that Church, and have promised to do so. And let me urge those who are conscious of having disobeyed that Church to be more regular in the future, and to remember that they have promised to perform the ordinances of the Church in the way the Church of England has appointed. I do not wish to know who they are. I readily believe it was not done carelessly; but still I am bound to say that it was not done without some presumptuous disregard to what they must have known to be their duty." The next point taken by Dr. Stephens was as to the use of holy water in Mr. Purchas's church. There was evidence that there was water in the church and that some of the congregation crossed themselves with it, but there was no evidence to show that Mr. Purchas himself blessed or consecrated any water, or that he used it himself, or that he caused it to be used by others. Counsel contended that the receptacle in which the water was placed being in a church under the exclusive control of Mr. Purchas, it was reasonable to suppose that the water was placed there with his consent and authority.

The Archbishop of York.—It is not proved that the water was blessed.

Dr. Stephens.—That would be difficult, for the consecration of holy water rarely takes in the church itself.

Lord Chelmsford.—You might have called "the ceremoniarius" and got the facts from him, although an adverse witness. There is certainly a strong presumption in your favour, but I do not think you can carry it further.

The Lord Chanceller.—The way it strikes us all is that there is not sufficient evidence.

Dr. Stephens said he should not persist after that intimation from the Court. The next point was as to the position of the minister. Mr. Purchas was charged with standing during the whole of the Prayer of Consecration with his back to the people.

Lord Chelmsford.—I think the evidence comes to this, that he stood in such a position that the great mass of the congregation could not see him break the bread.

Dr. Stephens.—The Judge below had assumed that the position of the minister had been settled by the decision of their Lordships in "Martin *v.* Mackonochie." But in fact, the position of the officiating minister was not considered in that judgment at all; it was the attitude and gesture merely that were dealt with. The question of "the north side of the altar" was one which had been much discussed, and involved a reference to very many authorities. Counsel having referred to several of these.

The Archbishop of York asked whether it was essential to his argument that the "end" of the table was not also to be called a side.

Dr. Stephen said it was.

The Lord Chancellor.—Do you contend that the priest must always stand at the north side of the table, however it may be placed?

Dr. Stephen said that was his argument. The north side was named to insure uniformity of practice.

The Lord Chancellor.—According t your argument it seems to me that should be called upon to twist round e Lord's table in the kingdom.

Dr. Stephens said he assumed f purpose of his argument that the c was standing east and west.

The point was still under consid when the Court adjourned.

UNITED STATES.

—Rev. Dr. Ewer, rector of Grace Church, N.Y. has returned from Europe.

—The Bishop of Ohio arrived from England on the 1st inst.

—A beautiful church has been erected at Edgewater, Staten Island, through the munificence of Mr. A. Ward.

—The Rev. P. K. Cady, D.D., has declined the Professorship of Systematic Divinity and Dogmatic Theology to which he was elected by the Board of Trustees on Oct. 28th.

—An addition of 35 feet by 75 has been made to the Church of the Heavenly Rest, in New York city, at a cost of $60,000. The top cornice of the new front is furnished with three life size figures, the central being that of the Redeemer and the side figures angels.

—For the sum of $6,270 the St. Stephen's Mission to the Poor in Boston has been able to dispense the following charities: — 45,588 meals; 320 loaves given to familes; 9,287 lodgings; 1,401 parcels of coffee, tea and sugar; 477 parcels of flour and meal; 713 pairs of shoes, socks, shirts, coats, trousers, flannels —not including 350 second-hand garments; 292 weeks' rent; 214 weeks' nursing, and special cases of relief in sickness; 59 parcels of fuel; 604 days' and weeks' work, and jobs done for and by the poor, and paid for; 232 articles made for the poor, and by the poor, and paid for; blankets, sheets, mattresses and cotton covers. Who can tell how much misery and crime this comparatively trifling sum has prevented?

A CHRONIC GRIEVANCE.

A writer in the *Episcopalian* says:—

Church fairs are again the *mode*. We think we hear the reader say, "Many a homily have you delivered against that way of raising money for religious purposes, but don't you see it does no good; the thing is as popular as ever?" But we happen to know otherwise. "Looker On" has been a good deal among the clergy of late, in order to obtain their views on the subject, and the result of his inquiries is such as to convince him that in almost every instance rectors are persuaded to it against their better judgment, and always with a tacit understanding with vestrymen and congregation "that this will be the last time they would have to resort to it." One or two worthy men, however, defended the "system," as they called it, on principle. Busines methods, they contended, should be apr to church matters. The lack of bu enterprise was one reason why practical work of the Gosp languishing. Nothing could be ed without money. God's not perform miracles. foolish overstraining to decline to av expedients which placed at their those usages wer with better pla supersede the and women everything, the glory makes nc brethren. or bet would to h the to fa